

Leigh T. Goddard (NV Bar No. 6315)
Daniel I. Aquino (NV Bar No. 12682)
Tara U. Teegarden (NV Bar No. 15344)
MCDONALD CARANO LLP
100 W. Liberty St. Tenth Floor
Reno, NV 89501
Telephone: 775-788-2000
lgoddard@mcdonaldcarano.com
daquino@mcdonaldcarano.com
teegarden@mcdonaldcarano.com

*Attorneys for KPG Investments, Inc.
and Kendalle Getty*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KPG INVESTMENTS INC., a Nevada
corporation; KENDALLE GETTY, an
individual,
Plaintiffs,
v.

Case No.:
3:22-cv-00236-ART-CLB

MARLENA SONN, an individual; AND DOES
1-20,
Defendant.

MARLENA SONN,
Plaintiff,
v.

Consolidated with:
3:22-cv-00323-ART-CLB

KENDALLE P. GETTY, as Trustee of the
Pleiades Trust and as an individual, KPG
INVESTMENTS, INC., as Trustee of the
Pleiades Trust, ALEXANDRA SARAH GETTY,
as Trustee of the Pleiades Trust and as an
individual, ASG INVESTMENTS, INC., as
Trustee of the Pleiades Trust, MINERVA
OFFICE MANAGEMENT, INC., and ROBERT
L. LEBERMAN,
Defendants.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

1 KPG Investments Inc. ("KPG") and Kendalle Getty ("Kendalle")¹ (collectively
2 "Plaintiffs"), by and through their counsel of record, the law firm of McDonald Carano LLP,
3 hereby complain and allege against Marlena Sonn ("Sonn") as follows:

4 **PARTIES**

5 1. KPG is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized under
6 Chapter 78 of the Nevada Revised Statutes and existing under the laws of the State of
7 Nevada.

8 2. Kendalle is currently a resident of the State of California.

9 3. Upon information and belief, Sonn is, and at all times relevant hereto was,
10 a resident of the State of New York.

11 4. Defendant Alexandra Sarah Getty ("Sarah") is currently a resident of the
12 State of California.

13 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant Robert L. Leberman ("Leberman"),
14 as President of Minerva Office Management, is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a
15 resident of the State of California.

16 6. Upon information and belief, ASG Investments, Inc. ("ASG Investments") is,
17 and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized under Chapter 78 of the
18 Nevada Revised Statutes and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada.

19 7. Upon information and belief, Minerva Office Management, Inc. ("Minerva")
20 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized under Chapter 78 of the
21 Nevada Revised Statutes and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 8. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28
24 U.S.C. §1332 providing for diversity jurisdiction over the claims alleged herein as this
25 matter is between citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds
26 \$75,000.00.

27 _____
28 ¹ Kendalle is referred to by her first name to avoid confusion with her sister Alexandra
Sarah Getty, who is also a party to this action.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1 course of the duties of Employee on behalf of the Corporation or as may be required by
2 court order or lawful subpoena, after reasonable notice to the Corporation.”

3 17. Sonn served as a corporate officer of KPG and is bound by the Employment
4 Agreement’s confidentiality provision.

5 18. Sonn is a Certified Financial Planner, whose responsibilities to KPG
6 included managing investments and providing financial advice.

7 19. During the time period that Sonn was employed as KPG’s Vice President,
8 she also served as a personal financial advisor to Kendalle.

9 20. Sonn was employed in a similar fiduciary capacity by another trustee of the
10 Pleiades Trust during this time period.

11 21. In mid-to-late 2017, Sonn urged and requested that Kendalle increase
12 Sonn’s compensation for her services as Vice President of KPG.

13 22. Thereafter, Kendalle’s legal counsel prepared a document reflecting a
14 schedule for bonus payments to Sonn (the “Draft Incentive Award Letter”). On October
15 18, 2017, legal counsel for Kendalle sent the Draft Incentive Award Letter to Sonn.

16 23. The Draft Incentive Award Letter (prepared by Kendalle’s legal counsel)
17 stated that Sonn would receive, upon the specified triggering events, two payments, each
18 of 0.00125% of the after-tax amounts received by Kendalle from the Pleiades Trust.

19 24. After receiving the Draft Incentive Award Letter from Kendalle’s legal
20 counsel, Sonn did not address the matter further with counsel. Instead, Sonn, without the
21 knowledge of Kendalle’s legal counsel, caused the letter to be revised to increase the
22 amount of money she would receive. Specifically, while the Draft Incentive Award Letter
23 stated Sonn would receive two installments of 0.00125% of the total after-tax distribution
24 to Kendalle from the Pleiades Trust, Sonn increased this percentage to two installments
25 of 0.00375%.

26 25. On or about November 10, 2017, Kendalle, on behalf of KPG, executed the
27 Incentive Award Letter as revised by Sonn (the “Incentive Award Letter”).³ The Incentive
28

³ See Exhibit 2.

1 Award Letter stated that Sonn would receive a one-time cash bonus (the “First Incentive
2 Bonus”) at the time of any distribution of funds to Kendalle from the Pleiades Trust in
3 excess of \$25 million, equal to 0.00375% of the after-tax distribution. The Incentive Award
4 Letter further stated that on the date of the final distribution of funds to Kendalle from the
5 Pleiades Trust, Sonn would receive a one-time cash bonus (the “Second Incentive
6 Bonus”) equal to 0.00375% of all after-tax distribution received after payment of the First
7 Incentive Bonus.

8 26. The Incentive Award Letter, which Kendalle initially prepared in conjunction
9 with advice from her legal counsel, contained important safeguards to ensure consistency
10 with the best interests of KPG and Kendalle.

11 27. Specifically, the Incentive Award Letter stated that Sonn would not receive
12 any payment if she did not remain employed by KPG at the time of any applicable
13 payment date. This requirement was vital to incentivize Sonn to adequately perform her
14 responsibilities and act in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle, so that she would
15 remain employed through the applicable payment dates.

16 28. The Incentive Award Letter also conditioned payment of any bonuses to
17 Sonn on Kendalle’s receipt of funds, after deduction of applicable taxes, from the Pleiades
18 Trust. This requirement was vital to ensure that KPG did not become liable to Sonn for
19 sums it had not yet received, particularly given that the Pleiades Trust contained
20 investments, subject to market volatility and risk.

21 29. In or around January 2021, Sarah, who had employed Sonn in a similar
22 fiduciary capacity, terminated Sonn’s employment.

23 30. Shortly thereafter, Sonn (realizing she would lose the Incentive Bonuses if
24 Kendalle also terminated her employment) formed a plan to convince Kendalle to remove
25 the safeguards protecting the interests of KPG and Kendalle set forth in the Incentive
26 Award Letter.

27 31. In or around early March 2021, Sonn requested payment of an additional
28 bonus amount from Kendalle.

32. In or around early March 2021, Sonn unilaterally drafted a Second Incentive Award Letter, purporting to modify the terms of the initial Incentive Award Letter.⁴ Kendalle had no role in drafting the Second Incentive Award Letter.

33. On or about March 14, 2021, Sonn presented Kendalle with the Second Incentive Award Letter and requested Kendalle sign the letter.

34. In presenting the Second Incentive Award Letter and requesting Kendalle sign the letter, Sonn falsely represented to Kendalle that the terms of the Second Incentive Award Letter were fair, justified, and in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle.

35. Contrary to Sonn's representations, the Second Incentive Award Letter was not fair, justified, or in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle.

36. The original Incentive Award Letter calculated Sonn's potential bonus as a percentage of the portion Kendalle would receive from the Pleiades Trust, after the deduction of applicable taxes. However, the Second Incentive Award Letter drafted by Sonn calculated Sonn's potential bonus as a percentage of the entire Pleiades Trust (not just Kendalle's share), before any tax deductions, totaling over \$1 billion, thus drastically increasing Sonn's compensation. The Second Incentive Award Letter provided that Sonn's total Incentive Award would be \$2.5 million.

37. In addition to unilaterally inflating her bonus, Sonn also removed the safeguards present in the original Incentive Award Letter.

38. The Second Incentive Award Letter removed the safeguard in the original Incentive Award Letter stating that Sonn would not receive any payment if she was not still employed by KPG at the time of any applicable payment date. Rather, Sonn drafted the Second Incentive Award Letter so that she would be guaranteed her inflated \$2.5 million even if she were terminated prior to applicable payment dates. This modification benefitted Sonn's personal interests, to the detriment of KPG and Kendalle.

39. Sonn drafted the Second Incentive Award Letter with an acceleration clause stating that, if Sonn's employment were terminated, regardless of the reason for

⁴ See Exhibit 3.

1 termination, payment of the entire \$2.5 million would be due within 30 days of termination.
2 While the original Incentive Award Letter incentivized Sonn to adequately perform her
3 responsibilities and act in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle (and thus remain
4 employed through the applicable payment dates), Sonn's modified Second Incentive
5 Award Letter did the opposite. It incentivized Sonn to perform poorly or against the best
6 interests of KPG and Kendalle so that Defendant Sonn's employment would be
7 terminated, thus accelerating her (now guaranteed) payment. This modification
8 benefitted Sonn's personal interests, to the detriment of KPG and Kendalle.

9 40. The Second Incentive Award Letter removed the safeguard in the original
10 Incentive Award Letter conditioning payment of any bonuses to Sonn on Kendalle's
11 receipt of funds from the Pleiades Trust. Instead, the Second Incentive Award Letter
12 provided Sonn would receive three bonus payments of \$833,333 each, which would be
13 made to Sonn on March 31, 2021 (within weeks of Sonn presenting the Second Incentive
14 Award Letter to Kendalle), March 31, 2022, and March 31, 2023, or, alternatively, within
15 30 days of Sonn's termination of employment.

16 41. While the original Incentive Award Letter protected the interests of KPG and
17 Kendalle by ensuring KPG did not become liable to Sonn for sums it had not yet received
18 from the Pleiades Trust, the Second Incentive Award Letter removed this critical
19 safeguard. The Second Incentive Award Letter not only allowed, but encouraged, Sonn
20 to create a situation where KPG would become liable to pay Sonn sums that KPG had
21 not received from the Pleiades Trust. Sonn's removal of this safeguard was particularly
22 egregious, since the actual amounts KPG and Kendalle would receive were subject to
23 volatility of investments and applicable taxes. This modification benefitted Sonn's
24 personal interests, to the detriment of KPG and Kendalle.

25 42. Sonn was initially provided a copy of the Draft Incentive Award Letter in
26 2017 via an email from Kendalle's legal counsel. Thus, Sonn was well aware that the
27 terms of the Draft Incentive Award Letter were prepared in 2017 by legal counsel for
28 Kendalle and KPG, and that Kendalle and KPG had received legal advice in connection
with that agreement.

1 43. Sonn was aware that Kendalle and KPG had independent counsel retained
2 that could advise on the propriety of executing the Second Incentive Award Letter, and
3 whether such action was in the best interests of Kendalle and KPG.

4 44. Despite this knowledge, Sonn pressured Kendalle to sign the Second
5 Incentive Award Letter and did not suggest to Kendalle or KPG that their legal counsel be
6 consulted in connection with the decision to execute the Second Incentive Award Letter.

7 45. Instead, Sonn actively discouraged Kendalle and KPG from consulting legal
8 counsel in connection with the decision to execute the Second Incentive Award Letter.
9 Sonn falsely told Kendalle that it was not necessary for Kendalle to speak to a lawyer
10 about the Second Incentive Award Letter.

11 46. Between March 14, 2021 and March 17, 2021, Sonn falsely represented to
12 Kendalle that the Second Incentive Award Letter was a “standard” document that served
13 only to corroborate and substantiate the terms of the original Incentive Award Letter.

14 47. Between March 14, 2021 and March 17, 2021, Sonn falsely represented the
15 nature of the amount of her bonus under the Second Incentive Award Letter, which was
16 in fact a percentage of the total Pleiades Trust.

17 48. When Sonn presented Kendalle with the Second Incentive Award Letter and
18 requested Kendalle sign the letter on or about March 14, 2021, Sonn was aware that
19 Kendalle was experiencing extremely stressful issues in her personal life. In addition to
20 these issues, Sonn was aware that the anniversary date of the death of Kendalle’s close
21 family member was occurring in this immediate time period.

22 49. Sonn expressed orally to Kendalle that the amount to which Kendalle would
23 commit by signing the Second Incentive Award Letter was \$2 million, when in fact the
24 commitment stated in the Second Incentive Award Letter is \$2.5 million.

25 50. Kendalle initially expressed to Sonn that the amounts Sonn was requesting
26 (which Kendalle believed to be \$2 million based on the discussion with Sonn) were quite
27 steep, and asked for time to think about the request.

28 51. Sonn did not respect Kendalle’s request, and instead proceeded to pressure
Kendalle, via oral conversations and written communications, to execute the Second

1 Incentive Award Letter and authorize its terms on behalf of KPG. Sonn repeatedly
2 expressed to Kendalle that she needed to hurry and sign the Second Incentive Award
3 Letter.

4 52. Sonn advised Kendalle that everyone else in Kendalle's life was against
5 Sonn, and discouraged Kendalle from allowing anyone else to review the Second
6 Incentive Award Letter.

7 53. Sonn was aware of Kendalle's personal circumstances at the time that
8 rendered Kendalle vulnerable to such pressure.

9 54. Prior to March 2021, Sonn befriended Kendalle and gained her trust so that
10 Kendalle would not question Sonn's advice or motives. As a result of these efforts over
11 the years, Kendalle trusted Sonn unconditionally at that point.

12 55. Sonn had access to all of Kendalle's personal and trust accounts. Sonn
13 assisted Kendalle with purchasing her residence. Sonn advised Kendalle on how she
14 should vote on all trust investments and related matters, and Kendalle came over the
15 years to unconditionally trust, accept, and depend upon all of Sonn's recommendations.

16 56. Sonn leveraged this position of trust and dependence in pressuring
17 Kendalle to quickly sign the Second Incentive Award Letter.

18 57. As a result of Sonn's pressure to execute the Second Incentive Award
19 Letter, Kendalle executed the Second Incentive Award Letter on behalf of KPG on March
20 17, 2021, just three days after Sonn presented the document to Kendalle.

21 58. Kendalle did not have any reason to believe that her execution of the
22 Second Incentive Award Letter was inappropriate or unwarranted due to Sonn's
23 representations that the terms of the Second Incentive Award Letter were fair, justified,
24 and in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle.

25 59. Having successfully coerced Kendalle into executing the Second Incentive
26 Award Letter, Sonn immediately took steps to secure payment of funds. On March 25,
27 2021, Sonn emailed KPG's Secretary and Treasurer Francis Nash (now deceased) to
28 demand payment of her first bonus award. Sonn was aware that Mr. Nash had been
suffering from a medical condition. Upon discovering that Mr. Nash was still sick, Sonn

1 requested that Mr. Nash ignore his other responsibilities and focus his limited energy on
2 processing her bonus payment, stating: “Rather than sending the February financial
3 statements, please save your energy to take care of making the manual payment on
4 ADP’s website.”

5 60. As a result of Sonn’s pressuring, KPG made the first bonus payment of
6 \$833,333 to Sonn on or about March 31, 2021.

7 61. While both the original Incentive Award Letter and the Second Incentive
8 Award letter required Sonn to execute a written release of claims against KPG and its
9 affiliates prior to receiving any payments, upon information and belief Sonn obtained this
10 payment without providing such a release.

11 62. Neither the original Incentive Award Letter nor the Second Incentive Award
12 letter altered Sonn’s confidentiality duties under the Employment Agreement.

13 63. Following Kendalle’s execution of the Second Incentive Award Letter,
14 various interested individuals associated with Kendalle learned of the Second Incentive
15 Award Letter’s terms. These individuals flagged the terms of the Second Incentive Award
16 Letter and informed Kendalle that the terms were, in fact, unusual.

17 64. Thereafter, Kendalle realized that Sonn had taken advantage of their
18 relationship and coerced Kendalle to execute a document that was not in her best
19 interests, or the best interests of KPG. Given that Sonn had breached her relationship of
20 trust in this manner, Kendalle could no longer permit Sonn to continue providing her
21 services in either her capacity as Vice President of KPG or as a personal financial advisor
22 to Kendalle.

23 65. On November 30, 2021, Sonn was notified that her employment with KPG,
24 as well as her relationship providing personal financial planning services to Kendalle, was
25 terminated.

26 66. On March 17, 2022, Kendalle and KPG initiated an action in Washoe
27 County District Court, entitled *KPG Investments, Inc. and Kendalle Getty v. Marlena*
28 *Sonn*, Case No. CV22-0444, asserting claims against Sonn for, *inter alia*, breach of
fiduciary duty as an officer of KPG, and fraudulent misrepresentation relating to the true

1 nature of the Second Incentive Award Letter. Notably, Kendalle and KPG submitted
2 redacted copies of the Employment Agreement and Incentive Letters, along with a motion
3 to seal the documents. Before the Second Judicial District Court ruled upon the Motion
4 to Seal, Sonn removed the case to the United States District Court for the District of
5 Nevada on May 26, 2022, and unilaterally disclosing the state court Complaint and
6 unredacted copies of the exhibits with her notice of removal.

7 67. On May 11, 2022, two months after Kendalle and KPG initiated their action,
8 Sonn filed suit against Kendalle and KPG in the U.S. District Court Eastern District of New
9 York, entitled *Sonn v. Getty et al*, bearing Case No. 1:22-cv-02758-RPK-VMS. Sonn also
10 asserted claims against Kendalle's sister Sarah, ASG Investments, Minerva, and
11 Leberman. Despite the confidential nature of the parties' business and contractual
12 arrangement, and the ongoing obligation to maintain confidentiality, Sonn filed her New
13 York complaint in the public docket without any attempt to redact, seal or maintain as
14 private the confidential information contained therein.

15 68. On June 21, 2022, the Los Angeles Times published an article regarding
16 Kendalle, KPG and the Gordon Getty family members, citing extensively to Sonn's New
17 York Complaint, which was filed in the open docket. Kendalle and KPG are informed and
18 believe that Sonn contacted a reporter at the Los Angeles Times to disclose the filing of
19 her Complaint against KPG and Kendalle.

20 69. Thereafter, the parties stipulated to consolidate these cases into a single
21 action in the District of Nevada, to participate in a settlement conference, and to stay all
22 proceedings pending the resolution of that settlement conference.

23 70. Shortly before the scheduled settlement conference, Evan Osnos
24 ("Osnos"), a journalist from The New Yorker, asked Kendalle to comment on recent
25 allegations Sonn had made about Kendalle, KPG, and other members of the Getty family.

26 71. On January 16, 2023, The New Yorker published Osnos' article entitled *The*
27 *Getty Family Trust Issue* (the "New Yorker Article").

28 72. Upon information and belief, Sonn spoke to Osnos and shared highly
confidential information about Kendalle and KPG's finances, including, but not limited to,

1 KPG's investment strategies, financial transactions and deliberations, taxes, and payout
2 expectations.

3 73. Sonn gained information regarding KPG's confidential information while she
4 was employed as KPG's Vice President, and subject to the confidentiality provision
5 contained in her Employment Agreement.

6 74. Upon information and belief, the New Yorker Article includes the confidential
7 information that Sonn provided Osnos in violation of the Employment Agreement's
8 confidentiality provision. The New Yorker Article reveals that Sonn had at least one
9 telephone conversation and one in-person meeting with Osnos in which she disclosed
10 confidential information.

11 75. Immediately after Sonn caused the New Yorker Article to be published,
12 Kendalle received anonymous offensive and threatening messages. Upon information
13 and belief, the threatening messages were sent as a result of the publicity created by
14 Sonn's breach of her confidentiality agreement.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Breach of Contract)**

17 76. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated
18 allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

19 77. On November 1, 2015, Sonn and KPG entered into the Employment
20 Agreement whereby Sonn would serve as the Vice President of Plaintiff KPG.

21 78. The Employment Agreement is a valid, binding, and enforceable contract.

22 79. Plaintiffs performed all conditions, covenants, and provisions required
23 under the Employment Agreement.

24 80. The Employment Agreement states, in relevant part, "Employee
25 acknowledges the Corporation's right and title to all proprietary materials which
26 constitutes all materials used in the Corporation's business, including financial information
27 and reports relating to any trust for which the Corporation may serve as trustee and
28 agrees not to disclose any such material to any third party except in the course of the

duties of Employee on behalf of the Corporation or as may be required by court order or lawful subpoena, after reasonable notice to the Corporation.”

81. Sonn breached the Employment Agreement by, among other things, disclosing KPG’s confidential information to third parties, including the Los Angeles Times, Osnos and The New Yorker, who publicized Kendalle’s and KPG’s confidential information in the New Yorker Article.

82. Sonn’s breach of the Employment Agreement caused anonymous individuals to send Kendalle offensive and threatening messages. The messages caused Kendalle emotional and mental harm.

83. Sonn caused, and will continue to cause, irreparable injury to Plaintiffs if she is not restrained from further breaching the confidentiality provision contained in the Employment Agreement. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law, and therefore seek injunctive relief under 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

84. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn’s conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of \$15,000.

85. Sonn’s conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief. Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney’s fees and costs incurred in bringing this action.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Contractual Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

86. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

87. Nevada law imposes a duty of good faith and fair dealing into every contract.

88. Sonn breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in the Employment Agreement by performing in a manner unfaithful to its purpose and deliberately contravened the intention and spirit of that agreement.

1 89. Sonn, under the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, had a legal
2 duty not to disclose confidential information that she learned while employed as KPG's
3 Vice President. Sonn deliberately contravened the intention and spirit of the Employment
4 Agreement by disclosing such information to third parties, resulting in the publishing of
5 KPG's confidential information in the Los Angeles Times and The New Yorker.

6 90. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
7 and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of
8 \$15,000.

9 91. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief.
10 Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing
11 this action.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Breach of Fiduciary Duty)**

14 92. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated
15 allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

16 93. NRS 78.138(1) states: "The fiduciary duties of directors and officers are to
17 exercise their respective powers in good faith and with a view to the interests of the
18 corporation."

19 94. As an officer of KPG, a Nevada corporation organized under Chapter 78,
20 Sonn had a duty to exercise her powers in good faith and with a view to the interests of
21 KPG.

22 95. As Kendalle's personal financial advisor, Sonn had a fiduciary duty to render
23 advice and recommendations that were in Kendalle's best interests.

24 96. Sonn's unilateral preparation of the Second Incentive Award Letter to
25 disproportionately inflate her compensation and remove numerous provisions
26 safeguarding the legal interests of KPG and Kendalle was not in the best interests of KPG
27 or Kendalle, and constituted a breach of Sonn's fiduciary duties.

1 97. Sonn's pressuring of Kendalle to execute the Second Incentive Award
2 Letter, and recommendation that she do so, was not in the best interests of KPG or
3 Kendalle, and constituted a breach of Sonn's fiduciary duties.

4 98. Sonn's statements to Kendalle that she did not need to consult legal counsel
5 or seek others' advice regarding execution of the Second Incentive Award Letter were not
6 in the best interests of KPG or Kendalle, and constituted a breach of Sonn's fiduciary
7 duties.

8 99. Sonn's misrepresentations to Kendalle regarding the justification for and
9 effect of the Second Incentive Award Letter were not in the best interests of KPG or
10 Kendalle, and constituted a breach of Sonn's fiduciary duties.

11 100. Sonn's concealment of material and relevant information from Kendalle,
12 including the true reasons for and effect of the Second Incentive Award Letter, was not in
13 the best interests of KPG or Kendalle, and constituted a breach of Sonn's fiduciary duties.

14 101. Sonn's leveraging of Kendalle's personal circumstances and her
15 relationship of trust with Kendalle was not in the best interests of KPG or Kendalle, and
16 constituted a breach of Sonn's fiduciary duties.

17 102. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
18 and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of
\$15,000.

19 103. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief.
20 Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing
21 this action.

22 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Fraudulent/Intentional Misrepresentation)**

24 104. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated
25 allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

26 105. Between March 14, 2021 and March 17, 2021, Sonn falsely represented to
27 Kendalle that the Second Incentive Award Letter was a "standard" document that served
28 only to corroborate and substantiate the terms of the original Incentive Award Letter. In

fact, the Second Incentive Award Letter contained major material modifications to the terms of the original Incentive Award Letter.

106. Between March 14, 2021 and March 17, 2021, Sonn falsely represented the nature of the amount of her bonus under the Second Incentive Award Letter, which was in fact a percentage of the total Pleiades Trust.

107. Between March 14, 2021 and March 17, 2021, Sonn omitted facts related to the true nature of the Second Incentive Award Letter, including the fact that the terms were not in the best interest of KPG and Kendalle, despite the fact that Sonn was bound in good faith to disclose such facts to Kendalle. Sonn's omissions are equivalent to false representations, as they constituted indirect representations that such facts did not exist.

108. Sonn knew and believed that these representations were false.

109. Sonn intended to induce Kendalle to execute the Second Incentive Award Letter based on her representations.

110. Given that Sonn was the Vice President of KPG, Kendalle's personal financial advisor, and someone that Kendalle believed to be her close personal friend, Kendalle justifiably relied on Sonn's representations.

111. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of \$15,000.

112. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief. Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing this action.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Misrepresentation)

113. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

114. Sonn, in the course of her employment with KPG and provision of personal financial planning services to Kendalle, failed to exercise reasonable care or competence

1 in obtaining or communicating the information to guide Plaintiffs in connection with
2 business transactions.

3 115. Sonn supplied false information and failed to disclose material information
4 she had a duty to disclose related to the nature of the Second Incentive Award Letter,
5 including facts related to whether the terms of the Second Incentive Award Letter were
6 fair, justified, and in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle.

7 116. Given Sonn's experience as a financial planner, status as Vice President of
8 KPG, and close personal and professional relationship with Kendalle, Plaintiffs justifiably
9 relied on information provided by Sonn.

10 117. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
11 and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of
12 \$15,000.

13 118. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief.
14 Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing
15 this action.

16 SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

17 (Rescission; Fraudulent Inducement; Unconscionability; Undue Influence)

18 119. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated
19 allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

20 120. In March 2021, Sonn made false representations to Plaintiffs regarding the
21 nature of the Second Incentive Award Letter, including facts related to the Second
22 Incentive Award Letter. Specifically, Sonn represented that the terms of the Second
23 Incentive Award Letter were fair, justified, and in the best interests of KPG and Kendalle.

24 121. Sonn knew that the representations regarding the nature of the Second
25 Incentive Award Letter were false or that she had an insufficient basis of information for
26 making the representations.

27 122. Sonn made the false representations with the intent that Plaintiffs would rely
28 upon the statements and execute the Second Incentive Award Letter.

1 123. Plaintiffs justifiably relied upon Sonn's representations in executing the
2 Second Incentive Award Letter.

3 124. Only once other non-interested parties provided Plaintiffs advice (which
4 Sonn actively sought to prevent prior to execution of the Second Incentive Award Letter)
5 did Plaintiffs discover that Sonn's representations were false, and that such
6 representations were designed to induce Plaintiffs to execute the Second Incentive Award
7 Letter against Plaintiffs' interests.

8 125. As a result of Sonn's fraudulent inducement, Plaintiffs are entitled to
9 rescission of the Second Incentive Award Letter.

10 126. The Second Incentive Award Letter is both procedurally and substantively
11 unconscionable.

12 127. Due to the circumstances surrounding the execution of the Second
13 Incentive Award Letter, including Kendalle's reliance on Sonn to act in her best interests,
14 which caused her to believe that no review of the terms was necessary, unequal
15 bargaining power was created between Sonn and Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs lacked
16 meaningful opportunity to agree to the Second Incentive Award Letter's terms.

17 128. The terms of the Second Incentive Award Letter, including the provision
18 entitling Sonn to a guaranteed schedule of payments totaling \$2.5 million that would
19 accelerate to be paid immediately upon her termination for any reason, were so one-sided
20 and oppressive as to constitute substantive unconscionability.

21 129. As a result of the unconscionable nature of the Second Incentive Award
22 Letter, Plaintiffs are entitled to rescission of the Second Incentive Award Letter.

23 130. Sonn exerted undue influence over Kendalle in pressuring Kendalle to
24 execute the Second Incentive Award Letter, based on events in Kendalle's personal life
25 and Sonn's fiduciary relationship to Kendalle.

26 131. Kendalle was unduly susceptible to the excessive and unreasonable
27 pressure Sonn placed on Kendalle to execute the Second Incentive Award Letter, the
28 terms of which were grossly one-sided and unfair to Plaintiffs.

132. Kendalle assumed Sonn would not act in a manner inconsistent with Plaintiffs' welfare.

133. As a result of Sonn's exertion of undue influence over Kendalle, Plaintiffs are entitled to rescission of the Second Incentive Award Letter.

134. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of \$15,000.

135. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief. Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Contractual Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

136. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

137. Nevada law imposes a duty of good faith and fair dealing into every contract.

138. Sonn breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in the original Incentive Award Letter by performing in a manner unfaithful to its purposes. Sonn breached her fiduciary duties, misrepresented material facts to Kendalle regarding the Second Incentive Award Letter, concealed material facts that she had a duty to disclose to Kendalle, and circumvented the terms of the original Incentive Award Letter.

139. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of \$15,000.

140. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief. Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing this action.

//

//

//

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Tortious Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

141. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

142. As Sonn was a fiduciary of Plaintiffs, a special relationship existed between Sonn and Plaintiffs.

143. As an officer of KPG and a trusted personal financial advisor to Kendalle, Sonn was in an entrusted position.

144. Sonn engaged in grievous and perfidious misconduct by seeking to remove the protections of Plaintiffs' legal rights set forth in the original Incentive Award Letter, preparing the Second Incentive Award Letter, misrepresenting the nature of the Second Incentive Award Letter, concealing material facts regarding the Second Incentive Award Letter, pressuring Kendalle to sign the Second Incentive Award Letter, and retaining funds paid as a result of her conduct.

145. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of \$15,000.

146. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief. Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing this action.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment, In The Alternative)

147. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

148. Plaintiffs conferred a benefit on Sonn by providing funds to which Sonn was not entitled.

149. Sonn knew of the benefit conferred by Plaintiffs and has been unjustly enriched, at the expense of and to the detriment of Plaintiffs.

1 150. As a direct and proximate result of Sonn's conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered
2 and will continue to suffer damages in an amount to be proven at trial, in excess of
3 \$15,000.

4 151. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief.
5 Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing
6 this action.

7 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Declaratory Relief)**

9 152. Plaintiffs hereby repeat, reallege, and incorporate all the above-stated
10 allegations of this First Amended Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

11 153. An actual and justifiable controversy has arisen and now exists between
12 Plaintiffs and Sonn with respect to the formation and validity of the Second Incentive
13 Award Letter and the obligations arising therefrom.

14 154. Plaintiffs deny that Sonn is owed the sums set forth in the Second Incentive
15 Award Letter.

16 155. To date, Sonn has retained \$833,333 she wrongfully received in connection
17 with the Second Incentive Award Letter. Sonn claims she is entitled to the remaining
18 amounts set forth in the Second Incentive Award Letter.

19 156. These issues are ripe for judicial determination because Sonn has retained
20 amounts she wrongfully received, and maintains that she is owed further amounts.

21 157. Plaintiffs request a judicial determination of the rights and obligations
22 between Plaintiffs and Sonn as described herein. In particular, Plaintiffs seek the
23 following declarations and determinations from the Court:

24 a. The Second Incentive Award Letter is void due to Sonn's fraudulent
25 inducement, the unconscionable nature of the agreement, and Sonn's undue
26 influence exerted over Kendalle;

27 b. Plaintiffs are entitled to repayment of the amounts paid to Sonn under
28 the auspices of the Second Incentive Award Letter in the amount of \$833,333; and

1 c. Plaintiffs are not obligated to pay Sonn any further sums under the
2 Second Incentive Award Letter or any other purported agreement.

3 158. Such declarations are necessary and appropriate at this time so that
4 Plaintiffs may ascertain their rights with respect to the subject matter of the parties'
5 dispute.

6 159. Sonn's conduct has required Plaintiffs to retain legal counsel to seek relief.
7 Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of their attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing
8 this action.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 For these reasons, Plaintiffs pray for relief against Sonn as follows:

- 11 (1) For general, compensatory, and punitive damages;
12 (2) For reasonable attorney's fees and costs;
13 (3) For prejudgment and post-judgment interest on all sums awarded according
14 to proof at the maximum legal rate;
15 (4) For the issuance of a preliminary or permanent injunction order enjoining
16 Sonn from further disclosing KPG's confidential information in accordance with the
17 Employment Agreement; and
18 (5) For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

19 Dated: July 10, 2023.

20 MCDONALD CARANO LLP

21 By: /s/ Leigh Goddard

22 Leigh T. Goddard, NV Bar No. 6315
23 Daniel I. Aquino, NV Bar No. 12682
24 Tara U. Teegarden, NV Bar No. 15344
25 McDONALD CARANO LLP
26 100 W. Liberty St., Tenth Floor
27 Reno, Nevada 89501
28 Telephone: (775) 788-2000
lgoddard@mcdonaldcarano.com
daquino@mcdonaldcarano.com
tteegarden@mcdonaldcarano.com

*Attorneys for Kendalle Getty and
KPG Investments, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of McDonald Carano LLP, and that on the 10th day of July, 2023, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT** was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system which sent electronic notification to all registered users as follows:

Max Ephraim Rodriguez
Pollock Cohen LLP
111 Broadway, Suite 1804
New York, NY 11211
max@pollockcohen.com

David Slarskey
Slarskey LLC
800 Third Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10022
dslarskey@slarskey.com

Agatha M. Cole
Beverly PLLC
43 Wets 43rd Street, Suite 159
New York, NY 10036
agatha@beverlypllc.com
Attorneys for Marlena Sonn

Mark H. Gunderson
Austin K. Sweet
Gunderson Law Firm
3895 Warren Way
Reno, Nevada 89509
mgunderson@gundersonlaw.com
asweet@gundersonlaw.com
*Attorneys for Minerva Office
Management, Inc. and Robert L.
Leberman*

Alice Campos Mercado
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
6005 Plumas Street, Third Floor
Reno, Nevada 89519
acm@lge.net

Lisa Cleary
Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
lecleary@pbwt.com

Matthew Savage Aibel
Paul Hastings LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
mattewaibel@paulhastings.com
*Attorneys for Alexandra Sarah Getty and
ASG Investments, Inc.*

*Attorney for KPG Investments, Inc. and
Kendalle Gerry*

/s/ Tracy L. Brown
Employee of McDonald Carano LLP

EXHIBIT INDEX

Ex. No.	Description	Page Count
1	November 1, 2015 Employment Agreement	4 Pages
2	First Incentive Award Letter	2 Pages
3	Second Incentive Award Letter	3 Pages